



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1470
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1470
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/920,588	08/01/2001	Juergen Wrede	10191/1899	5996
26646	7590	11/15/2006	EXAMINER	
KENYON & KENYON LLP ONE BROADWAY NEW YORK, NY 10004			ISMAIL, SHAWKI SAIF	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2155	

DATE MAILED: 11/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/920,588

Applicant(s)

WREDE, JUERGEN

Examiner

Shawki S. Ismail

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 August 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 17-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 17-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

RESPONSE TO AMENDMENT

1. This communication is in response to the amendment filed on August 18, 2006.

Claims 1, 2, and 13 have been amended.

Claim 16 has been cancelled.

Claims 1-15 and 17-20 are pending

The New Grounds of Rejection

2. Applicant's amendment and arguments received on August 18, 2006 have been fully considered, however they are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-15, and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The claimed limitation "the transmitting occurs when the motor vehicle is moving" is not described in the specification to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In fact no where in the disclosure is

Art Unit: 2155

there a mention of inkling that the transmitting occurs only when the vehicle is not moving. Appropriate corrections is required.

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the other of the user side". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 13 recites the limitation "the other of the provider side". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-15 and 17-20, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Brunemann et al, (Brunemann)** U.S. Paten No. **6,487,717** in view of **Tsumura** U.S. Patent No. **6,018,726** and further in view of **Levy** U.S. Patent No **6,493,676**.

Art Unit: 2155

7. As to claims 1, 2, and 13, Brunemann teaches a method for transmitting data between a respective data processing unit on a provider side and a respective data processing unit on a user side, the respective data processing unit on the provider side and the respective data processing unit on the user side in each case being operatively connected to a respective transmitting/receiving device for at least one of wireless transmission and wireless reception of data (abstract.) transmitting data from the respective transmitting/receiving device of one of the user side and the provider side (see abstract). Brunemann teaches a memory location and database for storing of data received at both the user and provider side (see Fig. 2 and Fig. 3). However, Brunemann does not explicitly teach a buffer storage for storing the data. Brunemann does not explicitly teach loading the stored data into the processing unit of the user and provider side only during an existence of a predefined operating state.

Tsumura teaches a system for automatically billing information services in conjunction with utilities services. The system includes a main unit and terminal unit. The terminal units receive data of various type tagged with a unique data identification code and they are also provided with a utilization status counter for storing data identification codes of data actually executed. A buffer is utilized for temporarily storing transmitted or received data (col. 7, lines 29-65). Stored data is then loaded to the processing unit to calculate service fees based on the stored data when the main unit transmits the appropriate data at regular intervals (col. 2, lines 45-60.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Brunemann and Tsumura to use a

Art Unit: 2155

buffer to store data received and then to load the data based on predefined operating state because it is faster and would reduce the processing time. A buffer acts as a flow control, which would transmit the data at a speed that the receiving unit can handle, which would otherwise cause overflow.

Brunemann and Tsumura do not explicitly teach wherein the predefinable operating state of the vehicle is when the vehicle is not moving.

Levy teaches a system and method for charging for vehicle parking through the use of mobile parking units. Each of the mobile units checks its location whenever the vehicle is not moving (operating state of the vehicle) and if the location coincides with a known parking area, a charge for parking is activated until the vehicle resumes traveling (col. 2, lines 11-27). The power delay unit maintains power to the mobile unit for as many hours as the timer was set for starting from the time the ignition switch is switched off (col. 11, lines 30-42).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Brunemann, Tsumura and Levy to use predefinable operating state of the vehicle (not moving) to load data into the processing unit on the user side and to maintain a power supply of the processing unit for a pre-settable time after the ignition has been turned off because doing so will make it easier to use the vehicle's sensors to determine if the vehicle is in the predefined operating state. The sensor are already available and would not require as much work to download the data off of them or to manipulate them as one sees fit.

Art Unit: 2155

8. As to claims 3 and 14, Brunemann teaches the method as recited in claim 2, wherein the data is one of a program and software (col. 2, lines 33-41).

9. As to claims 4 and 15, Brunemann teaches the method as recited in claim 2 wherein the respective data processing unit on the provider side is a server (col. 4, lines 13-20).

10. As to claims 5, Brunemann teaches the method as recited in claim 2, wherein the respective data processing unit on the user side is a programmable control unit in a motor vehicle (col. 3, lines 57-66).

11. As to claims 6-8, and 17, Brunemann teaches a method for transmitting data between a respective data processing unit on a provider side and a respective data processing unit on a user side, the respective data processing unit on the provider side and the respective data processing unit on the user side in each case being operatively connected to a respective transmitting/receiving device for at least one of wireless transmission and wireless reception of data (abstract). Brunemann and Tsumura do not explicitly teach a predefinable operating state of the vehicle where it is at least one of i) the motor vehicle is stationary, ii) a parking brake is set, iii) an ignition is switched off, iv) a driving switch is turned off, and v) an ignition key is withdrawn. Brunemann also does not explicitly teach maintaining a power supply of the respective data processing unit on the user side for a pre-settable time after at least one of: i) switching off the ignition, and ii) withdrawing the ignition key of the motor vehicle.

Levy teaches a system and method for charging for vehicle parking through the use of mobile parking units. Each of the mobile units checks its location whenever the

Art Unit: 2155

vehicle is not moving and if the location coincides with a known parking area, a charge for parking is activated until the vehicle resumes traveling (col. 2, lines 11-27). The power delay unit maintains power to the mobile unit for as many hours as the timer was set for starting from the time the ignition switch is switched off (col. 11, lines 30-42).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Brunemann, Tsumura and Levy to use predefinable operating state of the vehicle to load data into the processing unit on the user side and to maintain a power supply of the processing unit for a pre-settable time after the ignition has been turned off because doing so will make it easier to use the vehicle's sensors as the predefinable operating state. The sensor are already available and would not require as much work to download the data off of them or to manipulate them as one sees fit.

12. As to claims 9, 10, and 18, it contains similar limitations as in claim 1; therefore it is rejected under the same rationale.

13. As to claims 11 and 19, Brunemann teaches the method as recited in 9, wherein the central vehicle computer is connected via a bi-directional data bus to at least one data processing unit on the user side (col. 5, lines 36-60).

14. As to claims 12 and 20, Brunemann teaches the method as recited in claim 2, wherein the respective data processing unit on the user side includes at least one of: an engine management, an ABS system, an ELB system, an electronic stability program, a pneumatic suspension, a transmission-shift control, and a retard control (col.1, lines 14-45).

Response to Arguments

15. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, however they are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

16. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shawki S Ismail whose telephone number is 571-272-3985. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached at 571-272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2155

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Shawki Ismail
Patent Examiner
November 12, 2006



SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER